

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-17, and 19-24 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 12, 17, 20, 23, and 24 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-5 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on July 17, 2008, between Le V. Nguyen and Applicants' representative Bradley D. Spitz. During the interview, the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-17, 19-21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 was discussed. Additionally, proposed amendments to the claims in view of said rejection and distinguishing features of the claims as compared to the cited references were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as being non-enabling, and under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to claim 1 submitted herein.

#### **II. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-17, 19-21, and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-5, 7-17, 19-21, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle (U.S. 7,191,411) in view of Chu *et al.* (U.S. 2007/0198930) and Microsoft Windows XP ("MS XP"). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited in the subject claims. "To reject claims in an application under §103 . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *see* MPEP §706.02(j).

Independent Claim 1:

Independent claim 1 (and its corresponding dependent claims) relates to a system that facilitates access to data. The system can identify sets of data, such as directories containing computer files, and display a portion of at least one of the sets of data in a semi-collapsed view. Further, items displayed in the semi-collapsed view can be automatically selected to provide a user expedited access to items that are useful in connection with an application of particular interest to a user selected from among a plurality of applications being employed by the user. For example, the specification discloses that a user having a word processing application instantiated can view word processing documents in a semi-collapsed state to facilitate selection of relevant documents. (See p. 7, ll. 6-9). To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a component that determines data in at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view by selecting data in the at least one data set having a data type corresponding to a currently instantiated application selected from a plurality of currently instantiated applications, wherein the plurality of currently instantiated applications have disparate data types respectively associated therewith* and *a display component that displays the determined data in the semi-collapsed view*. The cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest such features.

Moehrle relates to techniques for expedited browsing of a multi-level hierarchical collapsing menu structure. (See abstract; col. 2, ll. 28-29). As a user selects items to navigate through a hierarchical menu, the selected items are displayed as “active links” in an “Active Path.” (See col. 2, ll. 33-41). Active links in the Active Path can be subsequently selected to facilitate direct access to a corresponding level or item of the hierarchical menu without requiring re-navigation through the menu. (See col. 2, ll. 41-44).

At Page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner interprets the Active Path and active links therein disclosed by Moehrle as a semi-collapsed view of a data set. However, Moehrle is silent as to *determining data in at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view by selecting data in the at least one data set having a data type corresponding to a currently instantiated application selected from a plurality of currently instantiated applications* as recited by independent claim 1. More particularly,

Moehrle discloses only that active links in an Active Path can be created by navigation through a collapsible menu structure associated with the Active Path. Thus, selection of items to display in the Active Path is based on the act of navigating an associated menu structure. This selection is performed independently of and without regard to the respective types of items in the menu structure, let alone any relationship between those respective item types and one or more applications being employed by a user.

The Examiner additionally relies on Chu *et al.* at Page 3 of the Office Action. Chu *et al.* relates to techniques for customizing the display of a collapsing tree diagram. As disclosed by Chu *et al.*, a user can partially collapse and/or partially expand a tree diagram interface by selecting nodes in the tree diagram to be hidden and/or displayed. (See paragraph 0045). Further, Chu *et al.* discloses that icons can be placed adjacent to a node to indicate that the node is in an expanded, collapsed, or partially expanded state. The icons can further be engaged to change the state of an associated node. (See paragraph 0057). Chu *et al.* additionally discloses that a set of “hot” nodes can be selected such that the set of “hot” nodes can be displayed in a partially collapsed state using a mechanism such as a “Hot Collapse” operation. (See paragraphs 0063-0064). However, like Moehrle, Chu *et al.* does not disclose or suggest *determining data in at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view by selecting data in the at least one data set having a data type corresponding to a currently instantiated application selected from a plurality of currently instantiated applications* as recited by independent claim 1. While Chu *et al.* does disclose the display of a selected set of “hot” nodes in a partially collapsed state, the reference does not disclose or suggest that “hot” nodes can be selected in relation to applications instantiated by a user. Rather, Chu *et al.* discloses only that “hot” nodes can be directly marked by a user or inferred by determining nodes that have been recently utilized by a user. (See paragraphs 0063, 0065).

To overcome the deficiencies of Moehrle and Chu *et al.*, the Examiner additionally relies on MS XP at Page 4 of the Office Action. MS XP relates to the Classic Start menu in Microsoft® Windows® XP. (See Fig. 2). The Classic Start menu includes an option for “personalized menus,” which allows seldom-used application shortcuts to be initially hidden when a user selects the Programs tab of the Start menu.

(See Fig. 3). The hidden application shortcuts can be displayed by clicking a button located at the bottom of the initial list of shortcuts. (See Figs. 3-4). Under certain circumstances, the Start menu will revert back to hiding the seldom-used application shortcuts after it is closed by the user.

At Page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner interprets the personalized Classic Start menu with hidden application shortcuts as a semi-collapsed view of a data set. Further, at Page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner interprets the grouping of document files in the Documents tab of the Start menu as shown in Fig. 5 of MS XP to be a grouping of items selected for display in a semi-collapsed view based on an application instantiated by a user. Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees with this interpretation and avers that MS XP does not illustrate or suggest *determining data in at least one data set to be displayed in a semi-collapsed view by selecting data in the at least one data set having a data type corresponding to a currently instantiated application selected from a plurality of currently instantiated applications* as recited by independent claim 1.

As shown in Fig. 5 of MS XP, display items corresponding to recently used documents are grouped together in the Documents tab of the Start menu. However, unlike the Programs tab, the Documents tab does not hide seldom-used items. Instead, the Documents tab merely serves as a document history by displaying links to the documents most recently opened by a user. Further, because the items displayed in the Documents tab are the last document files opened by the user, no determination of items to display in the Documents tab is made aside from merely providing a user history. Such a determination is performed independent of the types of items most recently opened by the user, and therefore does not constitute a determination of items to display based on an application of interest selected from a plurality of applications presently employed by a user as recited by independent claim 1.

Independent Claims 17 and 24:

Independent claims 17 and 24 relate to a method and a system, respectively, for facilitating access to data. Techniques are utilized wherein sets of data items are identified, information in at least one identified data set to be displayed in a semi-

collapsed state is identified based on respective types of the information relative to an application of interest being employed by a user, and the identified information is displayed in the semi-collapsed state. To this end, independent claims 17 and 24 respectively recite *identifying information in at least one set of data items to be displayed in a semi-collapsed state at least in part by determining information in the at least one set having an information type that is associated with an application selected from a plurality of applications currently instantiated by a user, the plurality of applications currently instantiated by the user having respective disparate information types associated therewith and means for selecting data in at least one identified set of data for display in a semi-collapsed view at least in part by selecting data in the at least one identified set of data that relates to an application selected from a plurality of executing applications being employed by a user.* These recited features function in a similar manner to independent claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons to those set forth above regarding independent claim 1, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited by independent claims 17 and 24.

Independent Claim 20:

Independent claim 20 relates to a user interface that comprises two portions – a first portion that includes data of a first data set that can be displayed in a semi-collapsed view, and a second portion that includes data of a second data set that can be displayed with data of the first data set in an expanded or collapsed view. Data of the first data set that are displayed in the semi-collapsed view can be selected based on respective types of the data in relation to one or more applications associated with a user. To this end, independent claim 20 recites that items displayed in a semi-collapsed view can be *determined based on respective classifications of the data items, one or more currently running applications associated with a user, and one or more respective data types utilized by the one or more applications associated with the user.* This recited feature functions in a similar manner to independent claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons to those set forth above regarding independent claim 1, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited by independent claim 20.

### **III. Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle in view of Chu *et al.*, MS XP, and Screen Dumps of East (“East”). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks directed to independent claim 20 above, from which this claim depends.

### **IV. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle in view of Chu *et al.*, Screen Dumps of IE (“IE”), and MS XP. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Independent claim 23 relates to a data packet having two fields – a first field containing data of a first data set that can be displayed in a semi-collapsed view, and a second field containing data of a second data set that can be displayed with data of the first data set in an expanded or collapsed view. As recited by independent claim 23, data of the first data set that are displayed in the semi-collapsed view ***are selected at least in part by identifying respective items in the at least one data set having an information type that corresponds to an executing application in a plurality of executing applications respectively having disparate information types corresponding thereto.*** This feature functions in a similar manner to independent claim 1. Thus, for similar reasons to those set forth above regarding independent claim 1, Moehrle, Chu *et al.*, and MS XP do not disclose or suggest all features recited by independent claim 20. Further, IE, which relates to techniques by which a data packet can be communicated between two or more computers, does not overcome the noted deficiencies of Moehrle, Chu *et al.*, and MS XP. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP523US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731